

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL. IV

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 18, 1911

No. 17

Other matters have crowded out, for a time, the consideration of a most interesting and important document in regard to the future of our small colleges. I refer to an address submitted to the trustees of Amherst College by the class of 1885, and issued from the office of Mr. E. Parmalee Prentice, 35 Wall St., New York.

With the enormous additions in recent years to the resources of our great universities, whether private, as are most of the Eastern institutions, or public, like the Western institutions, the question of the future of the small college has become more and more a burning one. Scientific instruction, as at present carried on, requires such an expensive plant that only in the great institutions can it be adequately provided for. Our smaller colleges have neither the equipment nor the instructors necessary for those who are looking forward to a life-work in what may be called scientific fields. The alumni of Amherst College, frankly recognizing this situation, have made the rather revolutionary suggestion that young men seeking a scientific training should not go to Amherst at all, but should try such institutions as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. What then is left for the small college? Has it any function at all? This address asserts positively that it has, and proceeds to define it as in general the training of men for the larger life of the community, "a training which should be undergone for the sake of learning and for the benefit of the state". This training is, in brief, the old classical training modified to meet the modern conditions of human interests. With the further suggestions in the report as to the necessity of raising salaries of professors so that they can be adequate teachers, I have nothing to do.

It seems to be high time to distinguish clearly what the advocates of vocational training really have in view. They put forward a very specious plea that a child's training should fit him for what he is going to *do* in life. They ignore entirely the other side. They have no concern with what a man is going to *be* in life. The conditions of life have been profoundly modified by scientific discoveries made by men, many of whom had no personal influence at all, but the majority of those who make their living by engineering or the other so-called vocational pursuits are not going to modify human conditions in this fashion. The question with them is not so much what they are going to do as what

they are going to be, what influence they are going to exert by their own personality upon their neighbors. It is a significant as well as unfortunate fact that the life of our nation has been and is being directed almost entirely by men who have no experience in statesmanship. They do not get this experience, nor even the preliminary breadth of view, from vocational training. They can only get it from a study of the world movements and world influences that have been moulding the life and the thinking of man for centuries upon centuries. That is a modern classical education. Our present view of the classical education does not mean one limited to the old curriculum of Latin, Greek and mathematics, but the ancient literatures must have an important place in any such training. The proper place for such an education is in the small college and not in the large university; in the small college men have time to grow instead of hustle, the object in view is primarily life and not money. Amherst could not do better than follow the suggestions of this address and many other smaller colleges would do well to give them serious attention.

G. L.

IN THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 3:153-154 Professor Lodge discussed the paper read by Professor Hale at the meeting of the American Philological Association, at Baltimore, in December, 1909, urging the adoption of a uniform system of grammatical terminology for all languages studied in our schools, whether ancient languages or modern. Professor Hale brought up the subject again at the last meeting of the Philological Association, at Providence, in December last, by carrying a motion authorizing the appointment by the Association of a Committee to consider the subject, if a request for the appointment of such a Committee should come from the Modern Language Association.

Members of The Classical Association of England have received a pamphlet of forty pages, called Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology. The Joint Committee consists of some twenty-four members, representing the following Associations: The Classical Association, The Modern Language Association, The English Association, The Headmasters' Association, The Headmistresses' Association, The Assistant Masters' Association, The Assistant Mistresses' Association, and The Association of Preparatory Schools.

The recommendations are in most instances unanimously made. An analysis of the report, with some comment, will be laid before our readers soon.

C. K.

AN APOCALYPSE IN ABBREVIATIONS

It was a Freshman class in the Odes of Horace—in many respects a fair output of the High Schools, in fact, a rather bright and intelligent group. Their reading ability was excellent, though their 'English into Latin' was often absurdly faulty, disclosing a lamentable lack of equilibrium in their previous instruction. But we had not been together long in the class-room, before I probed a peculiarly weak spot that seemed as much a matter of surprise to them as it certainly was to me. We were using a text-book in which the notes were grouped at the bottom of the page, and it was a half-dozen blunders with reference to the contents of these notes that first attracted my attention, then amazed me, and finally convinced me of an alarming deal of ignorance in the common science of abbreviation.

The conspiracy was at once formed in my mind, of pursuing my discovery farther and setting for my class, at its next session, a 'quizz' from the appendix of Webster's Unabridged. A curiosity had seized me, to ascertain the actual amount of knowledge they possessed in the simplest abbreviations to be met with in almost daily use. The test comprised about three dozen of these, all of them from the Latin, with the slight admixture of 'O.S.', 'N.S.', and 'N.Y.', which were interpolated solely to relieve the monotony, as 'jokers', if you please. Unless 'A.C.', and 'Q.v.' be excepted, all were of frequent occurrence, such as are encountered at some time or all the time in every day life, in a High School course, or in the consultation of books of reference, Latin or otherwise.

The sequel of my *quaestio* was rather a shock to my nervous system. It was revealed that an overwhelming proportion of my students were innocent of familiarity with the most domesticated word-abridgements and initials—even of their English meanings. Many of their attempts to express the Latin phraseology betrayed gross inaccuracy and a reprehensible failure in duty on the part of their primary and secondary teachers. When put to the test, the acquaintance my class had with abbreviations was found to be most superficial, while, as to the origin of those abbreviations from the Latin, few of the number seemed even to have surmised such a possibility. Abbreviations were so common, so prevalent, that they had been all but completely overlooked.

If I could persuade myself that the innocence manifested by this one class was a purely local or occasional one, I would hesitate to 'publish it in Gath'. But I have lived both long enough and widely

enough to note that abbreviations are taken much as we take everything else involved in 'the nature of things' and left, as it were, to the intuition. The veriest child may know 'The Dipper', but greyhaired grandsires will shake their heads in mute bewilderment at the mention of Aldebaran or Rigel.

The revelation of my test was such a strange one, that I gathered some statistics from the responses and filed them for my own future use. A subsequent thought has occurred to me, that the results of my experiment might prove of interest and, perhaps, a useful suggestion to my associates in the Classics. With this hope, I am subjoining the following excerpts.

B.A.

Only one in the class reported both English and Latin in correct form. One refused to essay even the English—an unfortunate who had doubtless, all his life, heard the academic degree spoken of as 'the B.A.'. Nine were obliged to submit the English only, though with 'Bachlor' and 'Bachelor' among the variants in orthography. I well knew that the Latin for 'Bachelor' would prove the *crux*, for it is not a word that the student will chance upon in the ordinary vocabularies, yet I must confess that the wabbly *cognomina* newly assigned to the bayberried gentry quite caught me off my guard. A fantastic 'Bachalareus artum' was the closest approximation. One of the class took refuge in '—— artis'.

M.A.

'Master' was evidently not in the same category with 'Bachelor', for there were three who had the correct Latin form for 'M.A.', and a proportionately smaller number resorted to the English alone, though one gave it as 'Master of Art'. As might have been expected, a blank was here also shown in the case of the one who had failed in 'B.A.'. The forms 'Artis', 'Artae', and 'Artum' were developed. But where is the Orbilius who could have connived at this *monstrum*—'Masteris'?

LL.D.

A complimentary degree, achieved but by the few, and therefore too far beyond the concept of novitiates—was it this that was responsible for the Trasmene of my infant academicians? Here were two blanks and only four who had even the correct translation. Among the faulty renditions were 'Doctor of Law', 'Doctor of Languages', and even 'Lawyer'. Novel Latin possibilities were '—— Legium', 'Legis ——', 'Doctor Legis', and 'Doctor Legorum'. And again I looked for Orbilius.

A.U.C.

Here, all would have been a dismal void, but for one brave girl who seemed to have the faint glimmer of a distant but errant truth, proposing 'Ante urbem constitutam'. Was this one of those elusive figures styled *hysteron proteron*? It was at least *prae-posterum*, both literally and metaphorically.

A.M. and P.M.

The bombardment of *errata* that here assailed me—actually without one single correct form of the original—reminded me of the Uncle Remus dictum, 'No dus' aint come'. There was one who ventured not even the English meaning. But 'the evening and the morning were the first day' for that one student, for I think that he gathered all the necessary data. There were two who correctly gave the English alone, without suggestion of the Latin derivation. Three got as far as 'Ante' and 'Post'. One was lost in the depths and had 'Anno' in brackets—surely a year must have been as good as a day to him. Five, remembering something of the astronomical features, produced the hybrid 'Ante' and 'Post meridian'; one, with the French in mind, submitted 'Ante' and 'Post midi'; there were an 'Ante' and 'Post meridiane'; while still another, apparently with little or no thought for construction, proposed 'Ante' and 'Post meridia'.

Ph.D.

There was a rift in the clouds here. Ten knew the correct English; an eleventh just missed it with 'Doctor Philosophy'; a twelfth was delirious, for he wrote 'Physician'; only one confessed complete defeat. There were a 'Doctor ——' a '—— Philosophia', and a 'Doctor Philosophii'.

A.D.

Only one gave both Latin and English correctly, the English alone, and one a blank. The presence of several academic degrees just preceding doubtless suggested to one the interpretation 'Doctor of Arts'. The rest were all awry. I was led to wonder whether their knowledge of the simplest Latin *elementa* had vanished—there was the most unblushing confusion of case and meaning. 'Ante Dominum', translated 'Before Christ', might have been correct, if only it had been correct. But there was another 'Ante Dominum', together with an 'Ante Domino', rendered 'After Christ'. One 'Anno Dei' was unique, to say the least; there was the *abortivum*, 'Ad Deum'; while there were enough 'Anno Domino's to start a game with.

A. C.

This abbreviation is so infrequently employed, in lieu of the more popular 'B. C.', that I rather expected some uncertain results, though I was not prepared for the *ruina cum sonitu* which was the issue. There was one timorous paper which expressed the answer correctly, but followed it with the interrogation mark in brackets. One other gave the English correctly. These were the sole answers attempted—the rest were altogether blanks.

M. D.

I little suspected the amount of unfamiliarity evinced with an abbreviation so frequent and so prevalent as this, but here again there were as many as eight who would volunteer the English only. One

of these expressed it as 'Doctor', which, though of course our popular phrase, looked undignified beside the other 'Doctors of Medicine'. But, oh! the Latin!—there were all sorts of 'doses' of medicine, not one of which was after the right prescription. Here are some: 'Medica ——', 'Medici ——', '—— Medico', and '—— Medicinis'.

Q. v.

This too, like 'A.C.', is not a very frequent usage—I was therefore surprised to find, amid the chaos that prevailed elsewhere, two answers in which the correct Latin was given, though omitting to give the English or to define the application of the term. In absolute ignorance and yet volunteering a guess, one had suggested 'Quod vix', *sans* explanation, and another introduced the nondescript 'Quivieve' (sic), but with the key attached, "the French for 'on the alert'".

E. g.

I felt quite philanthropic in placing this in the list. My reward was meager, though the responses were above the average. Among the curiosities vouchsafed for the English were 'therefore' and 'as'. 'Et quoniam', whatever that may be, was suggested for the Latin. I was willing to forgive this latter, on the plea of my poor handwriting, for I realized at once that my 'g' had been mistaken for a 'q'. 'Exempla grata' was proposed, with the meaning of 'pleasing example'.

I. e.

Ecce oasis in solitudine! actually ten knew both the Latin and its English translation; just two were familiar with the English only. But there was a ludicrous collection of 'Es ist', 'Is est', 'Ille est', and 'Illa est'.

Etc.

The issue here was not so flattering as under the gentle spell of 'I. e.', although there were happily no blanks. There were only seven who recognized both the Latin and the English of the curious tortile sign that used to be stationed as the rear-guard of our *abecedaria*. 'Et sequor' was among the erroneous renditions of the Latin. There were two who ventured only as far as 'Et'.

Et al.

I now drew six blanks; two 'perfects'; three with 'Et alia'; two with 'and ——'; one with 'Et al(i)ter', which was translated 'and other'; the climax was attained in the translation 'and all'.

Et ux.

My class had certainly been exempted from the vernacular of litigation, for only two knew the meaning and source of 'et ux.', while the rest were without the slightest suspicion.

Q. e. d.

One lone student gave the correct rendering. Whether the four blanks were handed in by students that had never taken geometry I do not know, but

the erratic answers given by the remainder made me suspect that there had been some instructors in geometry who had neglected to impress the value of Latin upon their pupils—instructors of a variety which the lexicon does not intelligently define, viz. 'misologists'. In the responses made by my class, the Latin formula for 'Q. e. d.' was usually incorrect, and, if, by lucky chance, it was correct, it was faultily translated. 'Quid' was as conspicuous as 'Quod'; the copulative was now in the present tense, now in the imperfect; the participle was masculine or neuter, perfect or future. The translations revealed such unintelligible *farrago* as 'which has been proven', 'what is demonstrated', 'that which is demonstrated', and 'stands for a conclusion drawn from the preceding statements', etc. And finally, there was the identical creation which moved the old farmer to exclaim, 'There haint no such animal', and it was labelled 'Quid est dit', with the appended libretto, 'which is said'.

Pp.

The Latin was *nusquam*, though 'Partes' was twice suggested. 'Paragraph' was one of the English renderings. I had not been explicit in defining which one of the several 'Pp's' I meant here—in fact, a hint from me in explanation might have spoiled the plot. So it was no surprise to receive answers from all three quarters, 'Pianissimo' being awarded the 'Venus-throw'. But the paper that interpreted it as 'Past participle' won the 'canis' by subjoining this bit of Neo-Latin in translation, 'Post particum'.

Et seq.

Unthinkable were the following—'Et sequor', 'Et secutus', and 'Et secuti'.

A farther rehearsal of my 'quizz' would grow wearisome, for its end was as its beginning. It was in very fact an abbreviation *in toto*. Two students suggested 'Aetna' as the full form of 'Aet.'; 'Doc. Divini' was vouchsafed for 'D.D.'; there seemed a disposition to establish a third conjugation for 'N. b.', for there were several 'Note bene's; while one translation of 'Cf.' was 'add'.

These Freshmen of mine were not wholly to blame for this blank in their education—indeed, their own personal share in the culpability was not large—only so far as any one can be reproached for failure to learn something outside of the appointed tasks. Neglected by those who should have instructed them, they had been left to absorb what they could from the list of abbreviations by accident or incident. The shock of their self-discovery reminds me of a lad in our community, many years ago, who received as a Christmas present an Anthology of the Poets. The donor, wishing to prove the acceptability of his gift, questioned the boy, some time afterward, as to what poems he enjoyed most. With perfect simplicity, the boy replied, that 'he liked those by Anon. best of all'. And I distinctly

recall a distressing instance of my own student-days—how I searched through card-catalogue and library and manuals of literature for the works of a mysterious Latin author named 'Ibid.', whom I found more often quoted in my texts than any other. Nobody ever told me, I was left to stumble upon the solution by finally recognizing, under that same false name, a well-known phrase of Caesar's, which was quoted, of course, just beneath another excerpt from 'Caes. B. G.'.

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON.

FREDERIC STANLEY DUNN.

REVIEWS

The Roman Republic. By W. E. Heitland. 3 Volumes. Cambridge: The University Press (1909). \$10.00.

When a new work appears in a field so thoroughly cultivated as that of the Roman republic, the question naturally arises, why was it written. An attempt to answer the question for these volumes will necessarily call attention to their leading features. Undoubtedly the public is aware of the fact that great strides have recently been made in the discovery and interpretation of archaeological material bearing on the early Italic, Etruscan, and Roman civilizations, and is hopefully looking forward to the appearance of a history of Rome which will take these discoveries into account, as the newer histories of Greece are taking account of the Cretan and Mycenaean civilizations. Mr. Heitland, however, has scarcely hinted at the existence of such material. Even if the interpretation of many details may never be agreed upon, this possibility is no excuse for avoiding a general description of the material with a tentative interpretation in broad outline. When the author does refer to an archaeological subject, it is only to prove himself far in the rear of progress. For example, in speaking of the bronze wolf set up by the Ogulnii in 296 B. C., he identifies it with the extant Capitoline wolf. Duruy cannot be blamed for adopting this view, but progress has been made since his time (see De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, 1.513, with references). If the author has no interest in archaeology and topography for their own sake, at least he should pursue these auxiliary studies so far as they bear directly on his chosen subject. Evidence of his neglect to prepare himself thus may be found in his map of the Servian Wall (1.30), which archaeology proves impossible for the regal period.

The author explains that his work is a political history. We should hope accordingly to find it strong in the treatment of organizations and institutions. Let us first notice his view of the structure of primitive Roman society. The theory which he holds that the patricians were originally the only citizens and that the plebeians were aliens was invented by Niebuhr, while historical method was still in its

crude beginnings and before sociology was born. The theory has no foundation either in the sources or elsewhere. Still worse is the identification of plebeians with the Ligurians and patricians with the Sabines. Doubtless the Romans were a composite of many peoples, and possibly the Latin language may be in great part Ligurian; but these circumstances do not warrant the identification of the social classes with the peoples mentioned, or with any others. The theory is disproved by the sources and by sociology. Social classes have quite a different origin.

To illustrate his method of dealing with matters of political organization it will suffice to consider his chapter on The Organization of Italy (1.165 ff.). In speaking of those who were bound to Rome by *civitas* he says, "Besides the ordinary citizens of the Roman Tribe-districts, this class contains (a) the municipia with or without local self-government, (b) the citizen colonies". In this statement he excludes (a) and (b) from the tribes, whereas it is a well-known fact that the *municipes* who enjoyed the unrestricted Roman citizenship were tribesmen. On p. 166 we find the remark, "But for various reasons it was found more convenient as time went on to do away with local governments when incorporation took place". This statement expresses what he evidently believes to have been a general policy, but in fact we know of only two communities treated as here described, and these cases were a punishment and only temporary. On p. 168 he writes, "But all who were in any sense citizens were under Roman law". Capua, however, was given the Roman law by special request in 318 B. C. (Livy 9.20.5), though it had become a *municipium* some years earlier; and as late as the time of Cato the Censor some of the laws of Arpinum were different from those of Rome (Cato, *Frag.* 61—Peter). These mistakes regarding matters usually well presented in Roman histories are enough to vitiate his treatment of the whole subject under consideration. His presentation of constitutional development is equally faulty, as could easily be shown, if the limits of this review permitted.

If he fails in political organization and constitutional history, perhaps his especial strength lies in his treatment of political struggles and reform movements. As an example of his work along these lines we may take his treatment of the Gracchi. He brands them sometimes as demagogues, sometimes as doctrinaires, who were striving for the impossible. "I have said that the reforms attempted by the Gracchi were impossible" (2.323). But certainly the three practical statesmen who framed the agrarian law for Tiberius believed that it would work; and Mr. Greenidge (*History of Rome*, 1.101), who has gone more deeply into this subject than perhaps any one else in recent times, considers this reform

practicable. The outcome of so complicated a situation could not be known with certainty beforehand. Mr. Heitland objects especially to the provision for rendering inalienable the small lots assigned to the poor. With reference to this point, the article of the American homestead law which requires the homesteader to occupy his "claim" five years in person before receiving a clear title to it has had a good effect; and the effect of the provision in question on the Gracchan homesteaders must have been similarly beneficial. Regarding the proposal of Tiberius to shorten the term of liability to military service the author remarks, "But for citizens the army-service was no longer so frequent a burden as it had been of old, and the proposal bears the stamp of the demagogue in despair". It is clear, however, that during the wars in Spain recruitment had become a burning problem [see the newly discovered epitome of Livy, line 177 f. (Kornemann) and the various laws and bills on the subject], and that reformers, including Tiberius, were making a vigorous effort to solve it. In criticism of the proposal of Tiberius regarding appeal he remarks, "As for the juries, made up of senators, their powers were derived from the Assembly of the Tribes, and we have already seen that no appeal from their verdicts was constitutionally possible. To allow such appeals would be revolution gone mad". Here Mr. Heitland forgets that there were also special courts, made up likewise of senators but deriving their power exclusively from the senate, and that it was to such courts that popular reformers from the Gracchi to the end of the republic objected. We may believe, then, that Tiberius had in mind these special courts when he made the proposal. In brief, Mr. Heitland, either through ignorance of the period under consideration or through prejudice, has entirely misjudged two great questions at issue between the Few and the Many. In his treatment of Gaius Gracchus he has assumed many things which we cannot possibly know, and on the basis of these assumptions he establishes the conclusion that the public career of the Gracchi was a great damage alike to the citizens, the allies, and the provincials. His study of the Gracchi is far inferior to that of Fowler in the *English Historical Review* and Classical Review, or of Greenidge in his *History of Rome*.

The third volume seems to be more carefully written than the first and second. Against Mommsen's point of view we find in this part a certain reaction, summed up in the uncouth sentence, "It is not necessary to worship Caesar: his work had got to be done". Notwithstanding the improvement it would be difficult to say in what respect this volume shows an advance upon various predecessors in the same field.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

GEORGE WILLIS BOTSFORD.

Die Ilias als Dichtung. By Carl Rothe. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schoeningh (1910). Pp. xii + 366. Mk. 5.40.

Professor Rothe has for thirty years been the constant reviewer of all works on the Homeric Question, being the regular contributor to Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen*, and the *Wochenschriften*; he has also published original investigations of great value on this subject, especially on the importance of the contradictions and the repetitions in Homer. He began his career as a follower and disciple of Kirchhoff, and his early reviews were quite in the spirit of that great demolisher of belief in the unity of the *Odyssey*. I take it that no scholar is more familiar with everything that has been written on the Homeric Question and all that it involves. In spite of his early beliefs and in spite of all the radical books and pamphlets he has studied Professor Rothe has reached the conclusion that the reasons for believing in a single Homer are unanswerable and that the arguments against this belief rest on too narrow a vision or on false assumptions. He is not a unitarian in the sense of a Nietzsche or a Bergk who sacrificed much to save a little, but one who accepts the tenth book, the twenty-third and the twenty-fourth as part of the same unity, a unity due entirely to one creative poet.

The book consists of two parts, one devoted to meeting the arguments of disintegrating criticism, the other to an analysis of the *Iliad* in which the harmony and poetic plan of the whole are set forth.

The method of the author is to consider each scene with its difficulties as it relates to the whole, and to observe whether an apparent contradiction or failure is peculiar to this one scene or characteristic of the method of the entire poem. Thus the failure of Odysseus to answer the questions of Arete, the wife of Alcinous, which was the starting point for the theory of Kirchhoff, loses its cogency when we find such failures to answer questions occurring frequently in Homer. A higher poetic necessity explains apparent slips or contradictions. Thus the argument that Hector should not have left the field of battle, but should have sent some inferior soldier to the City to bid the women sacrifice to Athena, fails to note that the real purpose of Hector's going was to permit the poet to relieve the strain of constant fighting and to allow the description of the scene between Hector and Andromache. Homer, like Schiller, cared little for logical motives; his thought was centered on describing the individual scene. Thus the long and seemingly inopportune speech of Nestor to Patroclus in the eleventh book took the hearer's mind away from fighting and also filled up the interval between the attempted retreat of the Greeks and their arrival within the

walls. The long delayed return of Patroclus to Achilles gave time to describe the events leading up to the sixteenth book, since it is inevitable that the intervening books could have had no place if Patroclus had returned at once and entered the fight, and he could not have remained inactive in the tent of Achilles. Thus, despite the difficulties inherent in Hector's taking from Patroclus the armor of Achilles, the exchange serves to advance a higher poetic purpose, since if Achilles had had his own armor when told of the death of Patroclus he could hardly have been restrained from entering the fight at once, and the evening of a crowded day must have sufficed for the deeds culminating in book twenty-two. Thus by the device of the exchange of armor Achilles is forced to wait for another day; there is then time for the completion of great events, and the tired hearer is relieved from the strain of fierce fighting by listening to the description of peaceful scenes in the smithy of Hephaestus. Thus fresh hearers and a new day are prepared for the impending tragedy.

The argument against the unity of the *Iliad* that the victories of the first day's fighting in which Diomedes and others easily surpass the best of the Trojans eliminates the 'wrath' of Achilles, since it renders him unnecessary, has until now seemed to me most cogent, but Rothe remarks that the success of the Greeks on this day was necessary for two reasons: first, the song was for Greeks and their national feeling could not have brooked initial defeat, secondly, the battle was due to a broken truce, and the sense of justice had been outraged if such treachery had been immediately followed by victory.

Just as the scene between Hector and Andromache, the long speeches of Nestor, the description of the making of the shield of Achilles take the thought of the hearer away from pictures of bloodshed, so it is a trait of Homer constantly to shift the scenes. The motive may be weak, but the eye of the poet was not on the motive, but on the scene; so he not only shifts the scene but varies the description of like events. Thus the warrior has now a Mycenaean shield, now a round shield, now a coat of mail, now the skin of an animal, and he fights with a sword, a spear, a bow, a rock; one warrior fights with a spear in each hand, and another with an iron club. Homer describes hundreds of fights; however great his genius such descriptions must become tiresome in the extreme, if all the warriors wore the same armor, but the poet's genius manifested itself exactly in this that he varied the things to be described.

Rothe argues that the age of a custom or the antiquity of a hero has no bearing on the relative position of the part in which they are described; a traditional hero may be joined to a creation of

the poet; Circe may belong to earlier songs, Calypso may be no older than the Odyssey, yet both be original in their present place in Homer. Thus no one part of the poems can be selected as older because older myths or customs are contained in it.

The author advances strong proofs that there are no arguments, of value, based on meter, myth, custom, language, or vocabulary for placing any part of the Iliad at an earlier age than any other. The real question at issue is one of poetry and all other issues are subordinate. If a scene is conceived in the spirit of the whole and contributes to the poetic end, it is part of the conception of the poem, even if it involves contradiction in minor matters.

This book of nearly four hundred pages is an abstract of the learning of thousands of pages of others, as well as the condensed beliefs of its author, so that a digest is impossible; it must be read in full to be appreciated. It contains the most telling arguments against all theories which have substituted others for an original, creative poet, and furnishes not only negative, but positive reasons for accepting once more the Homer of Aristotle and Aristarchus.

It is most significant that this great scholar should have begun as a follower of Kirchhoff, then gradually have become a believer in Homeric unity, and that Muelder in this same year should have completed a similar transformation, so that the one who a few years since was the most radical disciple of Wilamowitz should have made the first thesis to be established in his recent book the proposition that "The Iliad is a unity composed according to a single plan".

Professor Rothe never indulges in vague or uncertain conjectures, but keeps well within the realm of sober sense and ascertained fact; therefore he has written a safe guide for all Homeric students. In my judgment this is the best fruit of Homeric scholarship and no other book on Homer is so indispensable.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.

JOHN A. SCOTT.

MEETING OF THE NEW YORK LATIN CLUB

The New York Latin Club held its second meeting of the season at The Gregorian, Saturday, February fourth. Nearly one hundred members and guests were present. After the luncheon several matters of interest were brought to the attention of the Club. Dr. Riess introduced a resolution commending the recent action of the Harvard authorities whereby Latin is the foreign language required by that University as one of the entrance examination subjects to be offered by candidates for the A.B. degree. The resolution was unanimously adopted by the Club. Professor Knapp announced that contributions to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY from members of the Club would be welcomed by the editors. He further announced the annual

meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, to be held at Princeton University, April 21-22.

As Superintendent Maxwell, the speaker announced for the meeting, delayed his appearance, an invitation was given to Vice President Greene of the Board of Education to address the Club. He said he was a firm friend of classical studies and promised to do all in his power to retain them in our city high schools. In offering suggestions concerning the teaching of Latin he spoke with diffidence, since he was only a layman addressing the profession; but his ideas were warmly applauded by all present. He urged that pupils be taught the exact meanings of Latin roots and trained to recognize their significance in English derivatives. He emphasized the value of a knowledge of Latin to students of history and law, and recommended that the ancient authors now studied in schools be supplemented by reading great documents written in Latin, such as Magna Charta or the text of great international treaties.

Dr. Maxwell, City Superintendent of Schools, had been advertised to speak on College Entrance Requirements in Latin, but upon being introduced disclaimed previous knowledge of his theme and so talked to the Club on aims and methods in Latin teaching. He decried the vocabularies printed in the school texts of classical authors, which give the special uses of words rather than the root meanings, and from which pupils can obtain little or no etymological knowledge. Roman history should be taught by Latin teachers, as it logically belongs to their department. Sight reading of Latin Dr. Maxwell felt to be chiefly guesswork and as such of slight educational value. The first year's work in Latin as now outlined seemed to him overloaded with hair-splitting distinctions of syntax which are unnecessary and cumbersome. But he paid tribute to the great value of classical training and to the discipline which it alone can furnish.

His speech was followed by a discussion, made brief by the lateness of the hour. Professor Lodge corrected the misapprehension as to the real intention of an exercise in sight reading, which is not guessing at the meaning of Latin previously unseen but is ascertaining the meaning of a passage by applying the knowledge which a pupil has previously acquired. Sight reading in this sense Superintendent Maxwell admitted to be of great educational value. Thumbing repeatedly the leaves of a dictionary wastes much valuable time. Professor Knapp suggested a conference on the subject of first year Latin between the educational authorities of the city and a committee of the Latin Club. As Dr. Maxwell heartily concurred with the suggestion, President Harter was empowered by the Club to appoint such a committee.

ANNA P. MACVAY, Censor.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by the Classical Association of the Atlantic States, weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 535 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY**), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

Outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of **THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY** is one dollar per year.

Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEE LODGE, Teachers College, Columbia University

Managing Editor

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, Columbia University

Associate Editors

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

Printed by Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J.

Just Published

Gildersleeve's Syntax of Classical Greek

From Homer to Demosthenes. Second part.—The syntax of the simple sentence continued, embracing the doctrine of the article. By Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve with the coöperation of Charles William Emil Miller of the Johns Hopkins University.

\$1.50

The second part of a work which is by far the most comprehensive and scholarly exposition of Greek syntax ever published.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

HIGH SCHOOL COURSE IN LATIN COMPOSITION

By CHARLES MCCOY BAKER, Horace Mann School, Teachers' College, and ALEXANDER JAMES INGLIS, Horace Mann School, Teachers' College, 12 mo. Cloth. xiii+463 pages. \$1.00 net.

This book consists of three parts arranged for practice in writing Latin during the last three years of school, and, in addition, a summary of the Elements of Syntax for reference.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-68 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK
BOSTON CHICAGO DALLAS SAN FRANCISCO

REVISED EDITION

BARSS' WRITING LATIN

Based on Lodge's "Vocabulary of High School Latin."

"A pronounced advance beyond the first edition, and will prove useful in many schools."—D. O. S. Lowell, Headmaster Roxbury Latin School. Cloth 144 Pages. 50 cents.

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers

231-241 West 39th St.,

New York

Just published

SYNTAX OF EARLY LATIN

Volume I.

The Verb

By

Charles E. Bennett, Professor of Latin
in Cornell University.

xviii + 506 pages, 8 vo.

Price \$4.

It is believed that this work will be found of value not merely to specialists in the field of syntax, but to all progressive teachers.

ALLYN & BACON

New York

Boston

Chicago

Collar and Daniell's First Year Latin

PRICE \$1.00

Collar and Daniell's First Year Latin is well-known throughout the country as the standard text for beginners. It provides for the average class a substantial training in the elements of Latin. It is practical, thorough, accurate, and interesting to the pupil.

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue

New York

CAESAR COMPOSITION

By

H. F. SCOTT and C. H. VAN TUYL, University
of Chicago High School

PAPER, 120 pp. \$.30

An unpretentious yet effective prose book for second year. Based on the first sixty-two chapters of Caesar, with the principle of syntax stated in the lesson.

The authors have kept ever in mind that the Caesar pupil is only a beginner. They have not attempted to cover the entire field of high school prose.

There is an appendix of forms and an English-Latin vocabulary.

SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY

378 Wabash Ave., Chicago

37 East 20th St., New York